

## REMARKS

### Formal Matters

Claims 1-44 are pending and claims 15-44 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-14 were examined and rejected.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the remarks made herein.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hunkapiller in view of Zeleny, Brown, Anderson, Shakib and Balaban.

Claims 1 to 14 are directed to methods of fabricating an array of biopolymers by obtaining biopolymers from individual vessels, e.g., wells of a microtitre plate, and depositing the obtained biopolymers on different regions of a substrate. A feature of the subject invention, as described in the specification beginning at page 10 in connection with Figure 4, is that a map of the identity of the source vessels per se, and not just the biopolymers obtained therefrom, is obtained and printed onto the array substrate, in addition to the biopolymers. This feature of the invention allows one to obtain biopolymers from a plurality of different wells, such as the wells of a microtitre plate, deposit the biopolymers onto the substrate surface in a manner that does not have the same spatial layout as the microtitre plate source, and still be able to know the source well of the microtitre plate for each feature of the manufactured array.

Accordingly and consistent with the above, a feature of all of the above claims is that a map of the identity of the vessels used as sources for the biopolymers of the features of the array be applied to the substrate or housing associated therewith. In other words, **a map of the source vessels themselves, and not just the identity of the biopolymers obtained from the source vessels, is associated with the manufactured array.**

Turning now to the rejection, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of rejections to generate a map of the source vessels per se and

associate it with the manufactured array. In reading the office action, Zeleny appears to be the reference relied upon to provide the teaching of this element of the claimed methods. However, Zeleny is concerned with recording an identifier on the array which can be used to retrieve the appropriate scanning protocol to use in reading the array. There is no teaching or suggestion in Zeleny, or any of the other references included in the rejection, to specifically record a map of the identify of the source vessels of each biopolymer that is present in each feature of the array.

Because the cited combination of references fails to teach the element of the claimed invention in which a map of the identity of the source vessels per se is associated with the manufactured array, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-14 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hunkapiller in view of Zeleny, Brown, Anderson, Shakib and Balaban and that this rejection may therefore be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,  
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: April 13, 2004

By: 

Bret Field  
Registration No. 37,620

C:\Documents and Settings\Bret\My Documents\10010016-1 (AGIL-154) response to 1-13-04 office action.DOC